REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants are grateful to note that claims 1-4, 12-14 and 24-28 were allowed and Claims 7-10 were found allowable in the Office Action dated July 21, 2005. Claim 7 is being rewritten in independent form to place claims 7-10 in condition for allowance.

A formal objection to claim 28 has been satisfied by a minor amendment which does not change the scope of the claims.

Claims 5, 6, 11, 15-17, 19-23, 29 and 30 were rejected as being anticipated by Rudolph et al. The Examiner cited Rudolph's Figures 4 and 5B. Reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 5 and 15 (see for example Fig. 5A and the corresponding text) recite a synchronous rectifier and a method having the following features:

- a gate driver's positive input is coupled to the source of a power MOS device;
- the gate driver's negative input is coupled to the drain of the power MOS device;
- a reference voltage is coupled to one of the gate driver's inputs.

There is, however, no voltage reference in Fig. 4, which has a MOS device 120. Fig. 5B has a voltage reference 113, but no MOS device. There is no explanation in the Office Action of how Rudolph can anticipate either claim 5 or claim 15. For these and other reasons, claims 5 and 15 together with their dependent claims 22, 23, 29 and 30 should be allowed.

Referring now to claims 6 and 11, the rejections are respectfully traversed. Fig. 4 discloses a MOSFET device 120, but not the method of claim 6. Claim 6 recites "increasing the apparent drain to source on-resistance (Rdson) of the MOSFET device when the current flowing in the drain-source path of the MOSFET device is below a threshold level, thereby enabling zero crossing detection." There is no disclosure in Rudolph of such a step being performed on the MOSFET 120. The Examiner also alleges without any support in Rudolph that "below a certain threshold [of what?], 130 turns off ...." However, 130 is a diode and the Examiner gives no reason why it should be considered part of the claimed "MOSFET device" or even why the diode 130 would respond somehow to the drain-source current in the MOSFET 120 as to meet the terms of claim 6. For these reasons, at least, this anticipation rejection has no basis and should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 depends from claim 6 and recites the step of providing the MOSFET device with an offset voltage in addition to the method of claim 6. There is no offset voltage in the MOSFET circuit of Fig. 4. The Examiner cites a voltage reference 113 in Fig. 5B, but Fig. 5B has no MOSFET device. For this and other reasons, neither Fig. 4 nor Fig. 5B can anticipate claim 11.

Regarding claims 16, 17 and 19-21, again, each of these claims recites a combination of a MOSFET device and a reference voltage. Neither Fig. 4 nor Fig. 5B in Rudolph has both of these elements and accordingly neither figure can anticipate claims 16, 17 and 19-21. The rejection of claims 16, 17 and 19-21 should be withdrawn at least for this reason.

Allowance of claims 5, 6, 11, 15-17, 19-23, 29 and 30 is requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 21, 2005:

James A. Finder
Name of applicant, assignee or Registered Representative

Signature

December 21, 2005
Date of Signature

JAF:lf

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Finder
Registration No.: 30,173
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700